



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,066	07/10/2001	Joseph Weinberger	118-004F	1252
26633	7590	07/08/2005	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP 1717 RHODE ISLAND AVE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3001			POON, KING Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/902,066	WEINBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-22 and 25-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-22 and 25-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/25/2005.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222), Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and Stephens et al (US 4,644,478).

Regarding claim 16: Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38) comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) capable of being monitored by a computer (computer, column 9, lines 14-40) from a remote location, the copier comprising a control computer (column 20, lines 21-25, 38-40, 60-65) controlling the performance of the copier (diagnostic data, column 9, column 8, lines 42-65, column 12, lines 20-25), and a control panel (interface 104, column 12, lines 30-35) that configured to receive data from the control computer; a circuit/processor (fig. 1; the CPU of unit 102, fig. 4, column 11, lines 30-35) functions like the circuit of fig. 1) corresponding to the copier, the circuit/processor providing an interface (the part that functions like 20, fig. 1) for connecting the copier with a bi-directional (inherent properties of an local area network, column 8, lines 25-26) network, said bi-directional network being capable of

connecting the computer to a plurality of devices (fig. 2, column 16, lines 30-38), and a memory device corresponding to the copier, the memory device (RAM 102, column 11, lines 53-60) storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network, wherein said circuit/processor transmits the special information to the personal computer and identifies the copier remotely in the network and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51).

Kravette does not teach the computer is a personal computer.

Stephen, in the same area of computer, teaches the type of computer comprises personal computer which function can be programmed for specific application such as monitoring. (column 3, lines 20-35)

Since Kravette teaches to use a computer for the monitoring the copier and it is well known in the art that all computers can be programmed to perform a specific function, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using a personal computer as the monitoring computer, as taught by Stephen, because a personal computer is cheap, light, more variety and can be purchase from every computer stores.

Kravette does not teach the circuit is a chip/integrated circuit.

Hepworth, in the same area of interface circuit, teaches interface circuit and microprocessors can be putted in a chip (abstract, column1, lines 40-69, column 2, lines 5-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: putting the circuit/processor onto a chip.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette by the teaching of Hepworth because of the following reasons (a) a chip is small and light; and (b) a chip is cheap, Hepworth, column 2, lines 5-10.

Kravette also does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

Regarding claim 17: Hepworth teaches that it is well known in the art that an interface chip has first circuitry for converting serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converting parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data, and second circuitry for driving a pair of signal lines according to the converted serial data, the first and second circuitry being incorporated in the chip (column 1, lines 55-69).

3. Claims 18-22, 25, 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222), Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and Stephens et al (US 4,644,478) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Biffle et al (US 4,625,077).

Regarding claim 18: Kravette teaches the system comprises a telephone network (fig. 2).

Inherently a telephone network comprises a plurality of lines/phone numbers, Biffle teaches each of the plurality of phone lines having at least a pair (column 6, lines 35-40) of signal lines transmitting asynchronous serial data (column 9, lines 9-15, Kravette, column 2, lines 19-25, Hepworth).

Regarding claim 19: Kravette teaches wherein the plurality of lines comprises four signal lines (a phone network has at least four signal lines/four pair of twist pair) having the pair of signal lines.

Regarding claim 20: Kravette teaches wherein the pair of signal comprise a hard wiring (twisted pair are hard wiring).

Regarding claim 21: Biffe teaches wherein the pair of signal lines has high immunity from external noise sources (inherent properties of phone lines, column 2, lines 10-18).

Regarding claim 22: Kravette does not teach the computer is mounted on a computer board.

However, it is well known in the art, (official notice) that a computer is mounted on a computer board.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to mount the computer onto a computer board to stabilize the computer.

Regarding claim 25: Kravette teaches wherein the chip is a microprocessor (CPU of 102, fig. 4).

Regarding claim 27: Kravette teaches wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters (column 11, lines 53-60), a copy count (column 6, lines 45-50), and error code (column 13, lines 55-60, column 14, lines 60-65) are displayed on a display screen (column 7, lines 39-52) of the personal computer.

Regarding claim 28: Kravette wherein the control panel comprises a light emitting diode (column 4, lines 38-42).

Regarding claim 29: Kravette wherein the control panel comprises a liquid crystal display (column 4, lines 38-42).

Regarding claim 30: Kravette teaches wherein the control panel comprises a plurality of keys (column 9, lines 40-45)

Regarding claim 31: Kravette teaches wherein an error status signal is sent from the control computer to the control panel (column 9, lines 40-55).

4. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of McCracken (RE. 31222), Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712)

Stephens et al (US 4,644,478) and Biffle et al (US 4,625,077) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Ladewski et al (US 4,531,215).

Regarding claim 26: Kravette does not teach that the CPU is connected to an address decoder.

However, Ladewski, in the same area of CPU, teaches it is well known in the art to connect a CPU with an address decoder (20, fig. 1) such that the CPU can access other devices (column 2, lines 50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: CPU is connected to an address decoder such that the CPU can access the RAM or other units.

5. Claims 32, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and McCracken (RE. 31222).

Regarding claim 32: Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38) capable being monitored and controlled by a remote computer (computer in the central station, column 9, lines 14-40, column 8, line 47) the copier system comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) machine, a computer controller (column 12, lines 20-25) housed in the copier machine and configured to generate a status of the copier machine; an interface (fig. 1) for connecting the copier system with the remote computer by a bi-directional communication line (14, fig. 2 and telephone line)

connected to the remote computer, the interface comprising: a microprocessor (24, fig. 1); a memory device (the memory that stored copier ID, column 11, lines 50-60, column 6, lines 60-65 used by the copier to identify itself, column 6, lines 62-65) storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network corresponding to the copier, and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51); a communication circuit (12, fig. 1) and a driver circuit (14, fig. 1) capable of transmitting serial data stream over the bidirectional communication line.

Kravette does not teach a circuit for converting a first parallel data stream from the microprocessor into a first serial data stream and for converting a second serial data stream from the remote computer into second parallel data stream which the microprocessor processes.

Hepworth teaches that it is well known in the art that communication interface has first circuitry for converting serial data into parallel data for transmitting and converting parallel data into serial data, for transmitting (column 1, lines 55-69) in the area of using modem.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: a circuit for converting a first parallel data stream from the microprocessor into a first serial data stream for transmitting and for converting a second serial data stream received from the remote computer into second parallel data stream which the microprocessor processes.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette by the teaching of Hepworth such that communication over phone line using a modem is possible for the system of Kravette.

Kravette also does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

Regarding claim 35: Kravette teaches wherein the status of the copier machine monitored by the remote computer comprises at least one of setup parameters, a copy count and error codes (column 11, lines 53-60, column 6, lines 45-50, column 13, lines 55-60, column 14, lines 60-65) of the copier, and wherein data representing at least one of the setup parameters, copy count and error codes of the copier are transmitted via the interface to the remote computer in a format enabling a representation of the data to be displayed on a display screen (column 7, lines 39-52) of the remote computer.

6. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and McCracken (RE. 31222) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Ladewski et al (US 4,531,215).

Regarding claim 33: Kravette does not teach that the CPU is connected to an address decoder.

However, Ladewski, in the same area of CPU, teaches it is well known in the art to connect a CPU with an address decoder (20, fig. 1) such that the CPU can access other devices (column 2, lines 50-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: CPU is connected to an address decoder such that the CPU can access the RAM or other units.

7. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of Hepworth et al (US 3,975,712) and McCracken (RE. 31222) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Stephens et al (US 4,644,478).

Kravette does not teach the computer is a personal computer.

Stephen, in the same area of computer, teaches the type of computer comprises personal computer which function can be programmed for specific application such as monitoring (column 3, lines 20-35).

Since Kravette teaches to use a computer for the monitoring the copier and it is well known in the art that all computers can be programmed to perform a specific

function, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using a personal computer as the monitoring computer, as taught by Stephen, because a personal computer is cheap, light, more variety and can be purchased from every computer store.

8. Claims 36, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravette (US 5,077,582) in view of Stephens et al (US 4,644,478), Godsey (US 4,181,941) and McCracken (RE. 31222).

Regarding claim 36: Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38 comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) machine, a memory device (the memory that stored copier ID, column 11, lines 50-60, column 6, lines 60-65 used by the copier to identify itself, column 6, lines 62-65) corresponding to the copier, the memory storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier, and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51); a communication circuit (12, fig. 1) and a driver circuit (14, fig. 1) capable of transmitting serial data stream over the bidirectional communication line.

Kravette does not teach the computer is a personal computer.

Stephen, in the same area of computer, teaches the type of computer comprises personal computer which function can be programmed for specific application such as monitoring (column 3, lines 20-35).

Since Kravette teaches to use a computer for the monitoring the copier and it is well known in the art that all computers can be programmed to perform a specific function, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using a person computer as the monitoring computer, as taught by Stephen, because a personal computer is cheap, light, more variety and can be purchase from every computer stores.

Kravette does not teach a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the special information to the personal computer through the network, the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data used by said copier into serial data to be placed on the pair of wires.

Godsey, in the same area of transmitting signal using modem and telephone line teaches that it is well known in the art to use a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the signal over telephone line with modem by using the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data into serial data (column 4, lines 22-30) to be placed on the pair of wires (inherent properties of phone wire).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the special information to the personal computer through the network, the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data used by said copier into serial data to be placed on the pair of wires.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette by the teaching of Godsey such that communication over phone line using a modem is possible for the system of Kravette.

Kravette also does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

Regarding claim 37: Kravette teaches wherein the status of the copier machine monitored by the remote computer comprises at least one of setup parameters, a copy count and error codes (column 11, lines 53-60, column 6, lines 45-50, column 13, lines 55-60, column 14, lines 60-65) of the copier, and wherein data representing at least one of the setup parameters, copy count and error codes of the copier are transmitted via the interface to the remote computer in a format enabling a representation of the data to be displayed on a display screen (column 7, lines 39-52) of the remote computer.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument that Kravette does not teach the memory device storing special information to identify the copier in the network, the memory device capable of retaining data if power to the memory device is removed; has been considered.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Kravette teaches a copier system (e.g., fig. 2, fig. 3, column 16, lines 24-38 comprising: a copier (copier, fig. 2) machine, a memory device (the memory that stored copier ID, column 11, lines 50-60, column 6, lines 60-65 used by the copier to identify itself, column 6, lines 62-65) corresponding to the copier, the memory storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier, and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the computer (the program of the computer that controls the computer such that from the signal received, the computer is able to identify the copier, column 13, lines 45-51).

Kravette does not teach the memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed.

McCracken, in the same area of memory, teaches using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed (column 3, lines 35-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kravette to include: using memory device capable of retaining data if power is removed, as taught by McCracken because it would have prevented the unique identification stored in the memory from being lost which would cause system malfunctioning.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Elzind (US 5,585,704) teaches non-volatile memory is memory that save information in the case the power to the memory is removed (column 2, lines 39-41).

Edward et al. (US 3,558,912) teaches non-volatile means that information is preserved in the case the power, to the circuit that stores the information, is removed (column 1, lines 35-40).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 30, 2005


KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER